



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,998	10/06/2000	Christopher Peiffer	RLN-303	1970

23581 7590 11/05/2003

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.  
520 S.W. YAMHILL STREET  
SUITE 200  
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
----------

OSMAN, RAMY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/680,998	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PEIFFER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ramy M Osman	<b>Art Unit</b> 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claim 7 has been renumbered 6.

Misnumbered claim 8 has been renumbered 7.

Misnumbered claim 9 has been renumbered 8.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279).

Li teaches the invention as claimed including a system and method of transferring web page files (see Li, Abstract).

Art Unit: 2157

4. Li teaches a method for transferring web page source data between a web server and a remote client over a computer network, the method comprising (column 2, lines 19-67):

Receiving a request for the web page source data from the remote client, the web page source data containing renderable and non-renderable data, the request being received at an acceleration device positioned on the computer network intermediate the remote client and the web server (column 4 lines 4-15 and column 12 lines 8-45, Li discloses a client sending a request for a Web document, the request being received by a proxy server located between the client and a content server),

Filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable data from the requested web page source data, thereby creating modified web page source data (column 5 lines 27-67, Li discloses filtering and transcoding text summarization, document headings, comments and the like from a web page),

Sending the modified web page source data to the remote client (column 4 lines 4-15 and column 12 lines 8-45, Li discloses sending a customized document to a client), and

Wherein the non-renderable data is selected from a group consisting of whitespace, comments, hard returns, meta tags, keywords configured to be interpreted by a search engine, and commands not interpretable by the remote client (column 5 lines 27-67, Li discloses filtering and transcoding text summarization, document headings, comments and the like, which also includes whitespace, meta tags, etc.).

Art Unit: 2157

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279) in view of Bodin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,223).

7. In reference to claim 2, Li teaches the method of claim 1 above. Li fails to teach wherein filtering further includes filtering tags of the web page source data by rewriting tags of the web page source data in lowercase. However, Bodin teaches tokenizing HTML tags to reduce the quantity of data in the file (column 5, lines 25-67 and column 6, lines 1-32).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Li by tokenizing the tags as per the teachings of Bodin so that the quantity of data in the file is reduced thus facilitating transmission.

8. In reference to claim 5, Li teaches the method of claim 1 above. Li fails to teach compressing the modified web page source data before sending it to the remote client. However, Bodin compressing the tokenized HTML file(column 6, lines 30-45).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Li by compressing the modified web file as per the teachings of Bodin so that the quantity of data in the file is reduced thus facilitating transmission.

9. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279) in view of Antcliff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,835).

10. In reference to claim 3, Li teaches the method of claim 1 above. Li fails to teach sending an original, unfiltered version of the requested web page source data to the remote client. However, Antcliff teaches sending an original version of an HTML file to a client (column 4, lines 40-67).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Li by sending the original HTML file as per the teachings of Antcliff so that the file can be interpreted and generated into a web page after the client has viewed the transcoded web content.

11. In reference to claim 4, Li teaches the method of claim 3 above. Li fails to teach wherein an original, unfiltered version of the requested web page source data is sent to the remote client in response to a subsequent request from the remote client for the original, unfiltered version. However, Antcliff teaches sending an original HTML file in response to a request from a client (column 4, lines 40-67).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Li by sending the original HTML file in response to a client request as per the teachings of Antcliff so that the file can be interpreted and generated into a web page after the client has viewed the transcoded web content.

12. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279) in view of Kikinis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,159).

Art Unit: 2157

13. In reference to claim 6, Li teaches the method of claim 1 above. Li fails to teach wherein the web server and acceleration device are connected by a LAN. However, Kikinis teaches a Web server and a proxy server as nodes on a LAN (column 5 and figures 1&4).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Li by making the web and proxy servers connected by a LAN as per the teachings of Kikinis so that the servers can quickly and efficiently transfer information to each other.

14. In reference to claim 7, Li teaches the method of claim 1 above. Li fails to teach wherein the acceleration device and remote client are connected by a WAN. However, Kikinis teaches a proxy server and a client connected by a WAN (column 5 and figures 1&4).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Li by making the proxy server and client connected by a WAN as per the teachings of Kikinis so that the client can access the server from a remote location.

15. In reference to claim 8, Li teaches the method of claim 7 above. Li fails to teach wherein the WAN is the Internet. However, Kikinis teaches a proxy server and a client connected by the Internet (column 5 and figures 1&4).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Li by making the proxy server and the client connected by the Internet as per the teachings of Kikinis so that the client can conveniently access the server from a remote location.

***Conclusion***

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


- US Patent No. 6,332,131 B1
- US Patent No. 6,157,924 A
- US Patent No. 6,601,108 B1
- US Patent No. 6,122,666 A
- US Patent No. 5,918,013 A
- US Patent No. 6,247,048 B1
- US Patent No. 6,615,266 B1
- US Patent No. 6,275,829 B1

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M Osman whose telephone number is (703) 305-8050. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 305-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

RMO  
October 30, 2003

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100